UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,663	02/18/2004	Motoyuki Ohsugi	826.1919	1338

21171   7590   03/25/2008

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
CHOU, ANDREW Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 January 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8 and 9* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8 and 9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-9 have been amended. Claim 7 is cancelled. Claims 1-6,

and 8-9 are pending

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

01/03/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-9 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See Pieper US 2004/0205690 A1

art made of record below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Pieper US 2004/0205690 A1 (hereinafter Peiper).

Claim 1:

Pieper discloses a work flow program generating apparatus (see for example Figure 1,

and related text), comprising:

a storing device to store flow definition information which defines a process for

controlling a work flow (see for example Figure 1, item 1, "Meta Data Definition

Storage", and related text), and screen definition information which defines screen items

of a plurality of screens used in the work flow (see for example Figure 8, item 71, "Login

Procedure" is screen definition information, and related text); and

a generating device to read the flow definition information and the screen definition

information from said storing device, and to generate a screen program (see for

example Figure 1, item 3, "Process Generator", and related text), which includes a

program code for controlling a flow among the plurality of screens, by using the read

flow definition information and screen definition information (see for example Figure 1,

item 5, "Process Step", and related text).

Claim 2:

Pieper discloses a computer-readable storage medium (see for example page 2, [0028],

"..hard disk...", and related text) on which is recorded a program for causing a computer

to execute a process, the process comprising:

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines a process for

controlling a work flow, and screen definition information which defines screen items of

a plurality of screens used in the work flow (see for example Figure 1, item 1, "Meta

Data Definition Storage", and related text); and

generating a screen program, which includes a program code for controlling a flow

among the plurality of screens, by using the read flow definition information and screen

definition information (see for example Figure 1, item 3, "Process Generator", page 2,

[0031], Figure 2, S3, and related text)

Claim 3:

Pieper discloses a computer-readable storage medium on which is recorded a program

for causing a computer to execute a process, the process comprising:

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines a process for

controlling a work flow of a form process (see for example page 2, [0029], "...meta data

definition storage...meta data definition..."), and screen definition information which

defines screen items of a plurality of screens used in the work flow (see for example

Figure 10, page 7, [0078], and related text);

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, on which data for updating a form

table storing form data is input, and a screen program for displaying a screen, on which

data of the form table is referred to, by using the read screen definition information (see

for example page 5, [0056]);

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, on which data for updating a work

flow table storing data of the work flow of the form process is input, by using the read

flow definition information and screen definition information (see for example Figure 10,

page 7, [0078], and related text); and

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, on which data of the form table is

referred to, based on the data of the work flow table by using the read screen definition

information (see for example Figure 10, page 7, [0078], and related text).

Claim 4:

Pieper discloses a computer-readable storage medium on which is recorded a program

for causing a computer to execute a process, the process comprising:

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines a predetermined

number of hierarchical levels, on each of which an approver gives approval to a form, in

a work flow of a form process (see for example page 2, [0030], "…hierarchical with a

master node and a plurality of child nodes," and Figure 9, item 9, "Application Data

Storage", and related text); and

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, which includes input items of

approvers by the number of hierarchical levels, by using the read flow definition

information (see for example Figure 10, page 7, [0078], and related text).

Claim 5:

Pieper further discloses the computer-readable storage medium according to claim 4,

wherein

the computer reads, from the storing device, screen definition information which defines

screen items of a screen used in the work flow of the form process, and generates a

screen program for displaying a listing screen of forms, which wait for approval given by

the approvers, by using the read screen definition information (see for example Figure

7, "Process_1", "Process_2", and associated text).

Claim 6:

Pieper discloses a computer-readable storage medium on which is recorded a program

for causing a computer to execute a process, the process comprising:

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines a status of

presence of withdrawal of a form forwarded in a work flow of a form process or

withdrawal of a form forwarded in a work flow of a form process (see for example page

8, [0088], " …frame…"); and

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, which includes a button for

withdrawing a form, if the read flow definition information indicates the status of

presence of withdrawal, and generating a screen program for displaying a screen, which

includes a button for withdrawing a form, if the flow definition information indicates the

status of absence of withdrawal (see for example page 8, [0088], "…screen…").

Claim 7:

(Cancelled)

Claim 8:

Pieper discloses a work flow program generating method, comprising:

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines a process for

controlling a work flow, and screen definition information which defines screen items of

a plurality of screens used in the work flow, by a generating device (see for example

Figure 1, item 1, "Meta Data Definition Storage", and related text); and

generating a screen program including a program code for controlling a flow among the plurality of screens by using the read flow definition information and screen definition information, by the generating device (see for example Figure 1, item 3, "Process Generator", and related text).

Claim 9:

Pieper discloses a work flow program generating apparatus, comprising:

storing means for storing flow definition information which defines a process for controlling a work flow, and screen definition information which defines screen items of a plurality of screens used in the work flow (see for example Figure 1, item 1, "Meta Data Definition Storage", and related text); and

generating means for reading the flow definition information and the screen definition information from said storing means, and for generating a screen program, which includes a program code for controlling a flow among the plurality of screens, by using the read flow definition information and screen definition information ((see for example Figure 1, item 3, "Process Generator", and related text).

Conclusion

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Y. Chou whose telephone number is (571) 272-6829. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached on (571) 272-3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair- direct.uspto.,qov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free)

/Andrew Chou/

Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192